

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1, 3-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 22 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 1, 3-13, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Japanese Patent 10-268306 (“Takei”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,841,496 (“Itoh”). Claims 1 and 22 have been amended in this reply. Specifically, the limitation “wherein the first region accounts for a smaller portion of the reflection plane than the second region” has been added to independent claims 1 and 22. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in paragraph [0091] and Figure 8 of the Specification. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended, is directed to a reflection type display apparatus. Specifically, the reflection type display recited in independent claim 1, includes a reflection type display panel and a forward lightening apparatus. As recited in independent claim 1, the forward lightening apparatus, includes a reflection plane that is subdivided in two a first region capable of reflecting thereon light which is obliquely

entered from the forward lightening apparatus, and a second region capable of reflecting thereon external light which is entered at a substantially right angle along said reflection direction. In addition, the *first region accounts for a smaller portion of the reflection plane than the second region.*

In contrast, Takei and Itoh, whether viewed separately or in combination fail to show or suggest such an apparatus. Specifically, the Examiner has admitted that Takei does not teach a reflection plane that is subdivided into both a first region and a second region (*see* Office Action mailed 10/28/2003, page 5). Further, Itoh fails to show or suggest what Takei lacks with respect to claim 1. In particular, while Itoh discloses a “reflector in which convex and concave portions are provided” (Itoh, col. 29, ll. 51-52), Itoh does not teach or suggest the presence of a relationship between the concave and convex regions. Additionally, Itoh does not teach or suggest a reflection plane in which the first region is a smaller portion of the reflection plane than the second region.

In view of the above, Takei and Itoh, whether viewed separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Takei and Itoh. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Further, independent claim 22, as amended, includes essentially the same limitations as amended independent claim 1, accordingly, amended independent claim 22 is allowable for at least the same reasons as amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Takei in view of Itoh, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,233,031 (“Ishitaka”). As noted above, Claim 1

from which claim 14 depends has been amended in this reply. Accordingly, to the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ishitaka is directed to a liquid crystal display device and, more specifically, to a method for producing a reflection plane. Claim 1 is patentable over Takei and Itoh for the reasons stated above. Ishitaka fails to show or suggest what Takei and Itoh lack with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Ishitaka does not teach or suggest the presence of a relationship between the concave and convex regions of a reflection plane. Additionally, Ishitaka does not teach or suggest a reflection plane in which the first region is a smaller portion of the reflection plane than the second region.

In view of the above, Takei, Itoh, and Ishitaka whether viewed separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Takei, Itoh, and Ishitaka. Dependent claim 14 is allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Takei in view of Itoh, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,841,496 ("Funahata"). As noted above, Claim 1 from which claims 15-21 depend has been amended in this reply. Accordingly, to the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Funahata is directed to a method for producing a reflection plane. Claim 1 is patentable over Takei and Itoh for the reasons stated above. Funahata fails to show what Takei and Itoh lack with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Funahata does not teach or

suggest the presence of a relationship between the concave and convex regions of a reflection plane. Additionally, Funahata does not teach or suggest a reflection plane in which the first region is a smaller portion of the reflection plane than the second region.


In view of the above, Takei, Itoh, and Ishitaka whether viewed separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Takei, Itoh, and Ishitaka. Dependent claims 15-21 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 15115.015001).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/21/2004

for  48,885
Jonathan P. Osha, Reg. No. 33,986
Rosenthal & Osha L.L.P.
One Houston Center, Suite 2800
1221 McKinney Street
Houston, TX 77010
Telephone: (713) 228-8600
Facsimile: (713) 228-8778